

-- Questions and Answers --

(This Questions and Answers Document will be periodically updated on the Mound OU-1 website. Please check the date/time at the bottom of each page in order to determine when the questions and answers were added to the document. For purposes of clarity, the questions may be stated differently than the manner in which originally submitted to and received by the DOE.)

1. Please clarify...Eastern Standard Time or Eastern Daylight Time?

A. The time references in the RTP should have been Eastern Daylight Time (EDT). An amendment will be issued to reflect the above.

2. Can key personnel and past performance information be excluded from the 25 page limit?

A. Yes, the key personnel and past performance information is required to be submitted in Volume II, but it is not considered a part of the Technical and Management Proposal (L.3.1). Therefore, the key personnel and past performance information is excluded from the 25 page limitation.

3. Are we to send Attachment L-1 to our client references along with Attachment L-2? If not, how will the client know about what project we are referencing? However, if we are to send it, we need time to finalize and format it, which will seriously impact our schedule.

A. A revised Attachment L-2 with space for the contractor to insert appropriate project information will be provided in an amendment. Contractors may use Attachment L-1, the revised Attachment L-2, or its own version of the past performance reference letter to identify the project. Attachment L-1 shall be submitted with the contractor's proposal in response to the RTP. The project information used for the clients above must be sufficient to enable cross-referencing of Attachment L-1 and the returned questionnaires.

4. Can the client reference questionnaires be e-mailed back to the CO, or do they have to be mailed?

A. No. The questionnaires should be mailed.

5. **SECTION K -- On the DOE ID/IQ master contract, there was no language that suggested we would be required to recertify on every task in the master agreement. If the above language is going to be included in this and future RTPs, many of the Small Business might not bid in their current LLC/Team structures for this Mound OU-1 project. (For example if one member of the LLC out grows their size standard, then the entire LLC is no longer small, and would be excluded from bidding on Small Business set-aside tasks.) We greatly appreciate your input on the recertification request for Mound OU-1.**

A. This request for task proposals is not a small business set aside acquisition under FAR Part 19. This request for task proposals was issued to the CLIN 001 small business IDIQ contractors in accordance with the Ordering Procedures Clause H.10(c) 5 of the multiple award IDIQ basic contracts. Clause H.10 provides for limited competition of task orders solely among small businesses. In accordance with Clause H.10, competition for the OU1 task order was limited to the small businesses.

Additionally, Section K of the RTP does not require the contractor to recertify. Contractors are **not** to submit entirely new certifications. The expectation was that contractors would only update or change specific certifications as necessary. If there were not any changes or updates, the contractor would not submit any changes/updates and would not submit any certifications, other than those that may be attached to the RTP. There was not any expectation that a contractor would change or update the initial Small Business Program Representations, FAR 52.219-1 submitted by the contractors at the time of the submission of their proposals under and awards of the basic IDIQ contracts. The initial representation submitted under the basic IDIQ contract is applicable throughout the term of the contractor's basic IDIQ contract and it is not necessary to update or change. However, in order to avoid any misinterpretation whatsoever, the contractors should only provide changes or updates to FAR 52.209-5 Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Proposed Debarment and Other Responsibility Matters. If any of the events in the certification have not occurred since the submission of the initial representation, the contractor need not submit any changes or updates. Only if there have been events that have occurred subsequent to the submission of the initial representation should the contractor specifically inform the contracting officer of the changes and events that have occurred. There are restrictions upon the issuance of orders under indefinite quantity contracts if the events stated in the certification have occurred (reference FAR 9.405-1). The RTP will be amended to clarify that only the FAR 52.209-5 Certification should have changes or updates provided to the Contracting Officer.

Note: Contractors are reminded in performance of this RTP to comply with FAR 52.219-14 Limitations on Subcontracting contained in Section I of the basic contracts. This clause, the same as the representation, is applicable throughout the term of the contract.

- 6. Does Ohio Administrative Code rule 3745-27-13 apply to the removal and reconsolidation of the sanitary landfill or is it exempt according to 3745-27-13-(C)(2)? If it is not exempt, will a "rule 13" permit be required?**

A: Ohio Administrative Code rule 3745-27-13 applies to the removal and re-consolidation of the sanitary landfill, but as an Appropriate, Relevant, or Applicable Requirement (ARAR). Since the removal is being conducted under CERCLA and in compliance with the Federal Facility Agreement between the OEPA and DOE, the intent is to have the ARAR met by DOE submitting the Work Plan required under CERCLA and the SOW to Ohio EPA Southwest District for review and concurrence. The Contractor will prepare and provide the Work Plan to DOE. DOE will review the Work Plan submitted by the Contractor for acceptability and if acceptable, DOE will submit to Ohio EPA. The Work Plan will need to specifically address the substantive provisions provided in Rule 13. OEPA's approval/concurrence with the work plan is interpreted as meeting the Rule 13 permit requirement.

- 7. We would like to obtain a copy of the PRS-11 On-Scene Coordinator's Report referenced in Section, on page 8 of the Mound OU-1 RTP. Please either post this file or e-mail it as soon as possible.**

A: The OSC Report was posted on the Mound OU-1 RTP website on August 4, 2006.

- 8. Section L.4 (g) refers to the Disposal Waste Quantities Table (Table L-5) that we cannot find in Attachment L-5. We believe that this is the table that was originally included with the document provided by DOE EM CBC prior to RTP release entitled "Assumptions To Be Used For Contractor Cost Estimates" and documented the 2004 Volumes in BCY, the quantity of wastes Removed in 2005, and the waste Remaining in 2006. Since the Contractor's are not going to be able to independently verify the waste quantities based on the other data available, we feel that the DOE has to provide this data as an "official" part of the RTP.**

A: Attachment L-5 including the Waste Quantities Table was emailed to the Contractors on Aug 3, 2006. The first sentence in Section L.4(g) should state as follows: The Contractors are required to provide a reconciliation between the waste quantities identified in Attachment L-4, "Disposal Waste Quantities Table" and Attachment L-5, "Waste Quantities Table". An amendment will be issued to change Section L.4(g) and to provide a revised Attachment L-5.

- 9. Section J, Attachment D, Paragraph O references the PRS 441 Unique Work Package and states that it includes procedures, instructions, and applicable permits and notifications required to safely conduct the work. We have not been able to locate this document in either the RTP or the DOE EM CBC webpage. It is requested that DOE provide an electronic copy of this document to enable to prepare our proposal.**

A: The "Unique Work Package" for PRS-441 referenced in the Attachment D was not intended to represent a separate, stand-alone document that currently exists. An amendment will be issued to remove the capitalization from the term. The Contractor is responsible for developing the work package. The work package will be unique to PRS-441 work and will be provided by the Contractor with its submittal of the Work Plan deliverable in Section J, Attachment C, Deliverable No. 4. The RTP will be amended.

- 10. We have been unable to find any detailed information on the surveying and/or characterization that has been performed to date in PRS 441. Since DOE is requesting that we provide a cost basis to remediate this area, any data that is available regarding the size of the area, the quantity of soil to be removed, etc. is requested to be provided.**

A: This information can be found in the Mound Environmental Information Management System (MEIMS) report which was posted on the Mound OU-1 website.

- 11. CH2M Hill has been using the Mound rail yard to ship waste to Envirocare. How many rail cars have they been able to store on the siding at one time?**

A: Although CH2M Hill has been able to ship as many as 40 rail cars per week, it has limited the number of rail cars on the siding at one time to 20 on the basis of achieving efficiencies in loading.

- 12. Attachment L4 of the RTP does not contain waste volume such as those previously provided as part of pre-bid documentation handouts. Does DOE intend to provide waste volumes as part of Attachment L4?**

A: No. See answer to question eight. The waste volumes will be contained in a Waste Quantities Table as part of Attachment L-5 and these quantities were previously provided via email to the contractors. However, the Contractor is required to provide and complete Attachment L-4, Disposal Waste Quantities Table as part of its proposal. An amendment will be issued to clarify Section L.4(g) and to amend Attachment L-5. Based on the contractor's proposed approach, the quantities provided in Attachment L-4 may differ from the quantities provided in Attachment L-5, Waste Quantities Table.

- 13. Section C, Statement of Work, requires area PRS 441 to be completed in accordance with the Mound 2000 Work Plan. Are quantity estimates and characterization data that will be used to develop the Work Plan available for use in CLIN 6 cost proposal preparation? If not, will DOE provide assumed values?**

A: Attachment L-5, Waste Quantities Table, includes the assumptions and waste quantities. Contractors were provided the Waste Quantities Table on August 3, 2006. Attachment L-5 will be amended.

- 14. In April 2006 a draft document titled, "Proposed Response Action Plan for Operable Unit One (OU-1) Landfill" was issued. Have Regulators and Stakeholders reviewed and commented? If so, are responses available for review?**

A: The Final Response Action Plan and the ARARs were posted to the OU1 website on August 3, 2006.

- 15. Section L.1(c) states "The 25 page limitation does not apply to Section L2(b) and L 2(c)." Section L.2(b) is "...the cost and fee information in Section B that is to be provided as an attachment to the cover letter". There is no Section L.2(c). Please clarify this statement.**

A: Section L.1(c) of the RTP will be amended to state: "The 25 page limitation does not apply to Section L.2 or Section L.3.2 Key Personnel and L.3.3, Past Performance."

- 16. Regarding Section L.3.2(c), do the signed letters of commitment count toward the 25-page limit for the Technical and Management Volume?**

A: No. The signed letters of commitment are not part of the Technical and Management Proposal (L.3.1); however, the letters of commitment are required to be submitted as part of the Key Personnel submissions (L.3.2.) and are to be included in Volume II.

- 17. Regarding Section L.3(3)(d), does the past performance information submitted in Attachment L-1 count toward the 25-page limit for the Technical and Management Volume?**

A: No. The past performance information is submitted in Volume II, but is not considered a part of the Technical and Management proposal. The past performance information is excluded from the 25-page limitation.

- 18. Section J, Attachment D, Paragraph L references a Figure 4, Map of PRS 441. We have not been able to locate this map in either the RTP or the DOE EM CBC webpage of additional information. It is requested that DOE provide a CAD version of this map for the Contractors use in developing their proposal.**

A: Figure 4, Map of PRS 441 in Section J, Attachment D will be added by amendment. There is no CAD version available.

- 19. Regarding Section L.3.2(b), Key Personnel, do the resumes (using the format in Attachment L-6) count toward the 25-page limit for the Technical and Management Volume?**

A: No. See answer to questions #2 and #15.

- 20. C.2.2.4, CLIN 004, pg. 10 explicitly restricts excavation beyond the groundwater table; whereas C.2.2.1/2.2.2 (CLIN002) and C.2.2.3 (CLIN003) are silent and do not explicitly restrict excavation beyond the groundwater table. Please clarify if the CLIN 002 and CLIN 003 waste shown in reference cross-sections/diagrams or found that is located below the groundwater table is within scope.**

A: The waste beyond the groundwater table is not included with the work to be performed under the statement of work.

- 21. Please clarify closure status and limitations on use of the Surplus Soils Area (SSA) for operations.**

A: This area has been completed via the Mound 2000 process. If the Contractor uses the SSA in performing work under the task order, the Contractor shall restore the site in accordance with the SOW.

- 22. Will data collected during this project be required to be loaded into MEIMS? If so who is responsible for loading this data?**

A: Yes, data will be loaded into MEIMS by the DOE Legacy Management Office. The contractor will provide the data to DOE for input.

- 23. Is the capacity of existing water treatment system adequate to handle stormwater runoff?**

A: The water treatment system (air stripper) has a volume capacity of 150 gallons per minute and the extraction wells are providing a supply of approximately 100 gallons per minute. This leaves 50 gallons per minute available capacity. The contractor is required to quantify the volume of water treated for the monthly reporting for the outfall 003 permit to discharge.

- 24. In the Attachment L-5 document provided on August 3, 2006 via email, the assumptions table contained the following language in Assumption #13: "The site sanitary landfill wastes will be laboratory tested according to requirements set by the disposal facility and DOT." Please clarify.**

A: The document emailed on August 3, 2006 was sent to contractors in order to provide the waste quantities table in advance of an amendment to the RTP to include the waste quantities table in Attachment L.5. The assumptions were not intended to be changed and are correctly stated in the RTP, Attachment L-5. Contractors should use the assumptions as stated in the initial RTP, unless otherwise amended. An amendment will be issued replacing L-5 in its entirety.

- 25. Section C.2.4 (a) states Backfilling and regrading in the OU-1 area shall be performed prior to the FVS and any additional contaminated spot discovered during backfilling and regrading shall be removed prior to the FVS. These two statements are confusing and conflicting. Please clarify.**

A: Section C.2.4 (a) will be changed to state, as follows: "The Contractor shall conduct a Final Verification Survey in the PRS 441 area and all of the OU-1 areas. Final Verification Surveys shall be conducted using a plan approved by the Ohio and USEPA. The final Verification Survey shall be performed prior to backfilling and regrading in the OU-1 area (Section 2.5.1)." The RTP will be amended.

- 26. Section C.2.4 (b) first sentence states the Contractor shall collect all Final Verification Samples to a depth of known waste or un-sampled soil and analyze per SAAP. Please clarify the "or un-sampled soil" in the sentence.**

A: The first sentence should be replaced by the following sentence: "The Contractor shall collect all Final Verification Samples and analyze per the SAAP." This change will be reflected in an amendment to the RTP.

- 27. In terms of managing project costs, is it acceptable from DOE's perspective to collect overhead costs in a central account for certain individuals/positions such as the PM whose work will require daily involvement with all CLINS?**

A: See revised response below in "Denominator:" paragraph (also see the response to Question #91.) The proposed project support cost (WBS 4.0), Regulatory Interaction (WBS 5.0) and Public Involvement and Stakeholders Interaction (WBS 6.0) shall be allocated across all WBSs. The allocation methodology to be used by the contractors shall be total cost input base. The allocation percentage shall be calculated as follows:

Numerator:

Total Cost (Direct Labor, Overhead, Materials, Equipment, Subcontract, disposal, transportation, treatment, other direct cost, G&A and contingency) associated with WBS 4.0 through WBS 6.0

Denominator:

Total Cost (Direct Labor, Overhead, Materials, Equipment, Subcontract, disposal, transportation, treatment, other direct cost, G&A and contingency) associated with WBSs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, and 3.1, and 3.2.

The developed rate (from the above calculation) will be applied to the WBSs that are shown in the denominator and the resultant number placed on the line called "Allocation from WBS 4.0 through 6.0".

The RTP will be amended to change Section L and Attachment L-3 to incorporate the above.

- 28. L.4(g), pg. 8, has a typo and should reference Disposal Waste Quantities Table Att. L-4 (not L-5)**

A: See response to question #8.

- 29. Attachment L-5, Assumption #1, is missing the revised excavation and waste volume table as referenced. Assumption #20 is missing the Mound Cleanup Value table.**

A: See response to question #8. In an amendment, the Mound Clean Up Value Table will be relocated to the end of the Statement of Work and included as Attachment L-8 in Section L.

- 30. Provide copies of existing/current TSDF facility waste profiles and supporting characterization data used to satisfactorily dispose of soil, debris, and solvent/mercury-contaminated items from the PRS-11 excavation performed in Summer 2005.**

A: Five Excel spreadsheets and additional waste profiles containing PRS-11 excavation information were posted on the RTP website on August 9, 2006 and August 30, 2006.

31. Reference C.1.2, pg. 3, correct section cross-references in C.1.2(a)(ii)-(iv).

A: Section C.1.2(a)(ii) will be revised to reference Section C.2.2.1.
Section C.1.2(a)(iii) will be revised to reference Section C.2.2.2.
Section C.1.2(a)(iv) will be revised to reference Section C.2.2.3.

32. Reference Section J, Attachment D, page 24, Item N: The shaded areas in Fig. 1 are unclear.

A: Figure 1 in Section J, Attachment D, will be replaced by the same figure that is Figure 1 in Section C.

33. Reference L.1(b), pg. 1, confirm how/where DOE wants contractor to sign the RTP and acknowledge amendments.

A: The cover letter referenced in Section L.2(a) shall be signed and should also include acknowledgement and acceptance of the terms and conditions of the RTP and also include acknowledgement of any and all amendments, specifically by the amendment number(s).
Section L.1(b) will be amended.

34. Reference L.1.(c), pg.1 which references "L.2.(c)". Should this reference be L.2.(a)?

A: See response to question #15.

35. Reference L.1.(e), pg.2 which references "L.4.(C)(i)(8)". Please clarify.

A: Section L.1(e) will be amended to state: "See Section L.4 for Cost Proposal instructions."

36. L.2(a) and (b), pg. 2, require a cover letter with attached Section B cost and fee summary information. This conflicts with L.3(a)(2)...which states NO cost info is to be included in tech/management proposal.

A: The cover letter with an attachment containing the Section B cost and fee information is to be included in Volume I of the proposal. Section L.1(b) will be amended to clarify the above.

37. Reference L.3.1(a)(9), p. 4, confirm that these items are in addition to the five pages of fold-outs allowed by L.1(c).

A: ~~See response to Question #85. No, this information is not in addition to the page limitations identified in Section L.1(c). Section L.3.1(a)(9) will be revised by amendment to delete the following statement "These items are not included in the 25 page limitation for the Technical and Management section of the proposal." The information requested in Section L.3.1(a)(9) is substantive information and is to be included within the page limitations set forth in Section L.1(c) for the Technical and Management Proposal. The information can be included in the 25 pages or on the five fold-out pages permitted by Section L.1(c).~~

~~Additionally, Section L.1(c) will be amended to state that the page size for the 25 pages is limited to 8 1/2" X 11" and the 5 pages of fold-outs are limited to 11" X 17" each.~~

38. Provide full size hard copies of the Monsanto developed engineering drawings for the Overflow Pond Drawings. As currently provided, in the .pdf format, the drawings are only able to be printed out in a maximum 11" x 17" format. Since there is a considerable wealth of information regarding the original elevation of the landfill area, etc., these drawings can be very valuable in the development of excavation planning. However, as currently provided, we are apprehensive about scaling the drawings and/or digitizing them.

A: The full size drawings were sent by fed-ex to the Contractors on August 9, 2006.

39. What content may the foldouts discussed in RTP Section L.1(c) contain?

A: "Fold-outs" in Section L.1(c) may contain graphics, diagrams, schedules, tables, etc. at the discretion of the Contractor.

40. Does the Berm volume of 60,960 cubic yards swollen (presented in the waste volume attachment L-5) represent 50% or 100% of the total Berm volume?

A: The Berm volume of 60,960 cubic yards swollen presented in the Attachment L-5 represents 100% of the total Berm volume.

41. Will the contractor assume responsibility for water and power costs?

A: Yes, the Contractor will assume responsibility for water and power costs.

42. Confirm the intent of L.3.3(b), pg. 5, is to flag labor contracts above \$5M and not procured supplies and services (i.e. heavy equipment, waste disposal).

A: Section L.3.3(b) will be amended to add: "Exclusion: Past Performance Questionnaires are not required for proposed subcontracts with supply vendors or currently permitted commercial disposal facilities/federal Government owned facilities."

43. C.2.2(a)(iii), pg. 10, still shows excavation of HWD North before excavation of Dayton Unit, but DOE and MMCIC stated at pre-solicitation conference they intend to reverse this order. Please clarify.

A: The removal priority is as stated in Section C.1.1(g) and C.2.2. Contractors are reminded again that the RTP contains the terms and conditions upon which they should rely in preparing their proposals. Contractors were advised accordingly at the pre-solicitation conference.

44. Sect. J, Attachment C, p.15-17, clarify document numbers for PRS441 and which ones are for all of OU1.

A: Section J, Attachment C will be revised to clarify that Deliverables 9 through 33 are applicable to both PRS 441 and OU1. Deliverables 1 through 3 are applicable to only OU-1; and Deliverables 4 through 8 are applicable to only PRS-441. Information for the deliverables that are applicable to both OU1 and PRS 441 can be combined in one deliverable; however, information pertinent to OU1 and PRS 441 must be separately delineated or segregated. A revision to the Section J, Attachment C reflecting the above will be included in an amendment.

45. What is the extent of the PRS-441 remediation boundary under the scope of this contract?

A: See Response to #18.

46. Per the Statement of Work (SOW) Paragraph 2.2.3 Other Historic Waste Area, the historic waste area has been prioritized into three areas for cleanup: (1) Southern end and B2 Area south of the Overflow Pond dike, (2) Below the road, and (3) the northern end which lies under the southwest corner of the overflow pond dike and liner. At the pre-bid site walk, however, the director of the MMCIC stated that the historic wastes located under the southwestern corner of the overflow pond and dike was not considered (by MMCIC) to be as high a priority as removal of additional wastes from other areas of the site thus implying that removal of Dayton Unit wastes and sanitary LF wastes might be more important than excavating material currently covered by the overflow pond. Please verify that the RFP, as written, correctly prioritizes removal of wastes at the Northern end of the Historic Waste Disposal (area under the southwest corner of the overflow pond) as a higher priority than removal & disposal of the Dayton Unit Wastes and waste materials in the sanitary landfill.

A: The removal priority is as stated in Section C.1.1(g) and C.2.2. Contractors are reminded again that the RTP contains the terms and conditions upon which they should rely in preparing their proposals. Contractors were advised accordingly at the pre-solicitation conference.

47. Digital drawings (dxf format) of the cross sections were provided for the pond and sanitary landfill area. However, no plan drawing could be located (except for the hand-drawn plan from 1977). Does a dxf plan drawing exist?

A: All drawings known to exist have been provided.

48. The drawing by EHS titled Topographic Map, Test Boring, Well and Cross-Section Locations, data 04/26/06 contains topographic information that appears to predate the construction of the overflow pond. Does more current topographic information exist?

A: The Drawing by EHS titled "Topographic Map, Test Boring, Well and Cross-Section Locations", Dated 01/06/06 (titled "Detail Site Topography" on the website) shows the current topographic information. The Drawing by EHS also titled "Topographic Map, Test Boring, Well and Cross-Section Locations" dated 04/26/06 (titled "Overall OU-1 Site Map" on the website) is the pre-pond construction topographic information.

49. Section 2.4 Final Verification Survey states that the Surveys shall be conducted using a plan approved by Ohio and USEPA. What durations should the overall project schedule assume for the review and approval of the plans? Will Ohio and USEPA have approval authority of the surveys that may impact the backfill of these areas and does the DOE plan to have an independent survey performed by ORISE?

A: Reviews of each OU-1 project plan are anticipated to occur within 30 calendar days after submission by the contractor. DOE has approval authority with respect to surveys in support of the backfill activity with concurrence from both Ohio and US EPA. DOE plans to have ORISE independently verify the areas prior to backfill. The Contractor will be required to notify DOE in advance of its final verification survey date and provide sufficient time in order for DOE to mobilize ORISE to conduct the independent verification survey as the Contractor performs its final verification survey. Section C.2.4 (d) will be changed by amendment to state, as follows: "The Contractor shall notify DOE 30 days prior to the Contractor conducting the final verification survey(s). ORISE will conduct independent verification surveys concurrent with the Contractors Final Verification Surveys".

50. Are there site utilities still available such as water for dust suppression and electrical power? If so, at what location, available flow rate, voltage and amps?

A: The closest water connection available for dust suppression would be via connection to a City of Miamisburg hydrant along the roadway south of the project. Electric is available by getting a service connection from DP&L just south of the OU-1 area. Currently there is 480 volt, 3-phase service in the area. The Contractor is required to provide its own utilities.

51. Who will have review and approval authority over the individual site work plans and what is the expected duration of the review cycle?

A: DOE has approval authority following concurrence from both Ohio and US EPA.

52. Section J, Attachment E; is it the intent of DOE to transfer all of the equipment identified to the Contractor or only what the Contractor believes they can utilize? The RFP mentions disposition of the equipment, is it the intent of DOE to transfer the equipment to another DOE facility or commercially disposition the equipment especially if the equipment has residual radiological contamination?

A: DOE intends to transfer all identified equipment to the Contractor. The Contractor is responsible for proper disposition of all GFE under this task order per DOE O. 580.1. Proper disposition by the contractor may include transfer to another facility found by the Contractor in following the required screening process. Section J, Attachment A will be amended to include the DOE O. 580.1, Personal Property Management Program.

53. Who will be responsible for signature of the off-site waste manifest? Will the Contractor be authorized to sign on behalf of the DOE?

A: The Contractor is responsible for the Waste Management activities including packaging, shipping, and disposal of wastes, including signature of the off-site waste manifest.

54. Does the DOE plan to transfer any radiological calibration sources to the Contractor that are not identified on the equipment inventory?

A: The radiological calibration sources that are expected to be transferred are those stated in the RTP. An itemized list (Rad Std-Sources List) was posted to the RTP website on August 17, 2006.

55. Section C.1.2.(a). The Dayton Waste Unit is not described in the End-State discussion. Please provide the anticipated end-state for the Dayton Waste Unit.

A: Section C.1.2(a)(iv) will be amended to include the Dayton Unit Trench as follows: "Sample, package, transport, and dispose off site Other Historic Area wastes and Dayton Unit Trench waste (See Sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4)."

56. During the pre-proposal conference, it was stated that the contaminated soils that are potentially underneath the existing Overflow Pond are a lower priority than the other wastes within the OU1 area. We are unable to find such a statement in the RTP. Please provide the current DOE vision on the priority for waste removal and disposal.

A: The removal priorities are as stated in the RTP. Contractors are reminded again that the RTP contains the terms and conditions upon which they should rely in preparing their proposals. Contractors were advised accordingly at the pre-solicitation conference.

57. Section C.2.0.(c). Does DOE have any site specific requirements that the Contractor must meet for the analytical laboratory's data package and laboratory quality program. Many existing DOE sites have a costly requirement for the analytical data package with

respect to electronic format, etc. that is not necessary to meet the requirements of wastes disposal sites.

A: The contractor's analytical laboratory program is expected to be commensurate in quality to that of an accredited laboratory. A data analysis evaluation package will be required as referenced in the Mound 2000 Work Plan, Section 5.2.3, Sampling and Analysis Results.

58. Section C.4.2.(b).(ii). Is DOE anticipating that the Contractor's Environmental Monitoring Program will include requirements for monitoring of offsite soils, groundwater, surface water, crops, livestock, etc. or merely the annual site discharges to air, water, etc.

A: The contractor is required to provide an environmental monitoring program that demonstrates that all discharges and releases are in compliance with regulatory requirements. The contractor is responsible for ensuring compliance with Section 4.2(b) and with regulatory requirements."

59. Section J, Attachment B, PRS-409 and PRS-401: Please clarify the DOE's expectation for the Contractor's investigation and handling of these materials. Also, please clarify the location of PRS-409. As stated in the RTP, it is located on the northeastern corner of the Site Sanitary Landfill in the vicinity of the north-south access road. Since the north-south access road runs along the west side of the Site Sanitary Landfill and west and north of the Overflow Pond, we are unable to determine the potential location of this PRS.

A: Although these areas are in OU-1, they require no further investigation. These areas have been confirmed clean by the regulators and require no further sampling. PRS 410 is south of PRS 11 across the roadway. PRS 409 is south west of the overflow pond across the roadway almost due west of the access road south of the pond.

60. The RTP states that government-furnished equipment at the end of the job will be disposed. Does the government want the equipment decontaminated and returned to the government if decontamination is possible? If the government does not want the equipment returned, could the contractor have title to it?

A: See Response to question #52.

61. Statement of Work (SOW) Section C.2.4(a) states that "Backfilling and regrading in the OU-1 area (Section C.2.5.1) shall be performed prior to Final Verification Survey". However, SOW Section C.2.4(b) states "The Contractor shall collect all Final Verification Samples to a depth of known waste or un-sampled soil and analyze per SAAP", implying sampling before backfilling, especially since backfilling with up to 95% soil compaction would make sampling at the depth of known waste difficult. Was Final Verification Survey meant to be prior to backfilling instead of after backfilling?

A: See responses to Questions #25 and #26.

62. Statement of Work (SOW) Section C.2.4(a) states that "The Contractor shall conduct a Final Verification Survey in the PRS 441 area and all of the OU-1 areas. Should SOW

Section C.2.4(2) read "The Contractor shall conduct a Final Verification Survey in the PRS 441 area and *all the disturbed areas* of the OU-1"?

A: See responses to Questions #25 and #26.

63. For schedule planning and budgeting purposes, should the contractor assume that steps 1-3 of the CERCLA Response Action Process for OU-1 will have been already completed prior to the contract start date and that the contractor picks up these activities with the Work Plan Development?

A: The final Response Action Plan for the OU-1 Project was issued in July 2006 which is Step 3 of the CERCLA Process described in Section H.902(d) for the OU-1 Project.

64. Please confirm that a water truck is available (it was on preliminary equipment list).

A: There is no water truck available as a GFE item.

65. What interaction (i.e., meetings, document reviews, etc.) is expected under this contract with the existing Legacy Management Contractor performing work at the Mound?

A: DOE/LM is responsible for Mound compliance monitoring and any associated reporting and operating of the OU-1 Pump & Treat system. As a result Contractor environmental management / monitoring activities may require coordination with LM activities.

66. What is the soil type used in the existing sanitary waste cap and liner?

A: Clay rich soils native to the OU-1 area.

67. In order to price TCE contaminated soil disposition we need to make an assumption on the level of TCE contamination. Given that DOE has provided the volume assumptions, will DOE also provide an assumed level of TCE soil contamination? This will ensure that all vendors are using the same assumptions relative to waste disposition pathways and cost.

A: The data was provided in MEIMS.

68. Section J, Attachment B, Historical Waste Disposal Area, Geophysical Anomaly Area: Please clarify the first bullet that states an anomaly was encountered above the thorium drum are that appears to be caused by buried metal associated with either the thorium drums or the deeper Dayton Unit wastes. How can the anomaly be above the thorium drums and possibly be resulting from metals within the thorium drum zone or Dayton Unit wastes.

A: Anomaly B-2 is adjacent to the B-1 anomaly location (PRS-11). A portion of the B-2 magnetic anomaly was excavated during the Pump & Treat system installation and was found to only contain miscellaneous metal debris (no contamination was observed).

69. Response to Question 10 provided on August 8 stated that characterization information for PRS 441 could be found in the Mound Environmental Information Management System (MEIMS) report posted on the OU-1 web page. Please provide guidance or additional information on how to trace specific sample data points to PRS 441 footprint. Are there unique sample ID's traceable to PRS 441? SOW, 2.3 (b) references a data package for PRS 441. Recognizing that it hasn't been signed or sent for public comment can it be made available as a "draft" to assist in developing the proposal? Also, MEIMS spreadsheet is locked. It can be viewed but won't allow different sorts or manipulation of the data for ease of use in preparing the proposal. Will DOE provide unlocked version of MEIMS to allow data sorts and easier use of the data for proposal preparation?

A: The PRS 441 is about 3.4 acres. Files (spreadsheet and .pdf) that show the sample locations and the data for PRS 441 were posted on the website (8/17/06) under PRS 441 Specific Information. These files provide information on how to trace specific sample data points. SOW Section C.2.3(b) will be amended to delete the reference to the data package. The MEIMS spreadsheet is locked to prevent any alteration to the file. The data package will not be provided.

70. SOW, 2.5 Site Restoration (b), states, "if the Contractor determines that the Site Sanitary Landfill waste can appropriately and properly be disposed on-site, the Contractor...." Does "on-site" mean a) anywhere in the Mound Site footprint? b) within the perimeter of the current OU-1 landfill boundary? c) within the OU-1 Work Area as defined in Figure 5 of the SOW?

A: "On-site" means within the OU-1 boundary; south of the existing pond, north and east of the two roadways.

71. SOW Section 2.5.1(e) Is the storm water retention/detention basin "for the Historic Waste Disposal Area" the existing Overflow Pond? Or is this in addition to the existing overflow pond that is currently North of OU-1?

A: It is not the existing overflow pond.

72. Please post the following documents used recently by CH2M HILL Mound, Inc.;
Existing Radiation Protection Plan
List of the applicable radiation protection procedures
Final Verification Survey Plan(s)
Example Sampling And Analysis Plan (SAAP)

A: The list of Radiation Protection Procedures and the Radiation Protection Plan were posted on the website on August 21, 2006. Other manuals and operating procedures that were used at Mound site were posted on the RTP website. Example SAAP is not available, nor is the Final Verification Survey Plan.

73. SOW page 6, Section C. 2.0 Para (e), second sentence reads:

“The Contractor may be required to complete sub-sections 2.4 and 2.5 prior to completing all work in sub-sections 2.1 and 2.2 to ensure the overall final cost of work performed does not exceed the allowable funding for the OU-1 Project.”

Please clarify how this sentence affects the sequence and funding priority for each CLIN.

A: There is only a specific amount of funding (\$29 million) available for the work associated with OU-1, i.e. CLINS 001 through 005. As the contractor is performing work in accordance with the priorities established by the task order (SOW) and by the contracting officer, the contractor must always ensure that the estimated costs to complete the work under C.2.4 and C.2.5 are taken into consideration before incurring costs for the work under CLIN 001 through 005. The estimated costs include incurred costs and accruals (work ordered or performed, but not yet invoiced costs). Regardless of the stage of the waste removal, if the estimated costs for completion of Sections C.2.4 and C.2.5 when added to the costs already incurred for the waste removal plus the fixed fee is approaching \$29 million, the contractor will have to no longer remove the waste. Instead, the contractor will have to complete the work under Sections C.2.4 and C.2.5, regardless of the stage of the waste removal.

The contractor must ensure that the work it is performing and the estimated costs for Section C.2.4 and C.2.5 plus fee remains within the \$29 million, even if some of the wastes in sections C.2.1 and C.2.2 are not or cannot be removed from the site. The Contractor MUST reserve a sufficient amount to complete survey and restore the project (Sections C.2.4 and C.2.5) at all times.

74. Section L, Attachment L-5, Assumption #21 currently states the following:

“Verification samples will be collected on a 15-foot triangular grid (1 sample/197ft²). If needed, they will be collected at 4-foot depth intervals”.

If the verification sampling is meant to be interpreted as final status survey sampling, then the second sentence regarding “...4-foot depth intervals” isn’t clear because final status survey samples are taken from the bottom of the excavation. Please clarify this assumption.

A: Surface grid sampling would be performed in all areas. Additional sampling at depth would only be required in those areas where free release could occur but no excavation of wastes occurred (e.g. areas to the east and north or under the road where there has been no indication that wastes were ever present).

75. Can you please provide the most current radiological survey of heavy equipment (rolling stock)?

A: The list of radiological survey of heavy equipment was posted on the OU-1 RTP website on August 21, 2006.

76. Would DOE consider changing the Past Performance criteria for the relevant past performance information to be within the last five years, rather than within the last two years?

A: No. The task order past performance criteria is for recent contractor past performance information. The past performance information of the EM IDIQ awardees, beyond two years, was evaluated during the solicitation process prior to the award of the EM IDIQ contract.

77. It is requested that DOE provide a basis of assumptions for PRS 441. This basis, at a minimum, should include the surface area of the railcar loadout facility and the anticipated average depth of excavation over that area. In addition, it is requested that DOE provide information that quantifies the depth of the gravel/rock that was spread over the area and whether or not excavation of soils beneath this "wear" layer is anticipated?

A: The PRS 441 is about 3.4 acres. Files (spreadsheet and .pdf) that show the sample locations and the data for PRS 441 were posted on the website (8/17/06) under PRS 441 Specific Information. The depth of the gravel/rock that was spread over the area is "shallow".

78. Can the Contractor assume that existing DOE contracts for the disposal of low-level radioactive wastes at facilities such as Envirocare (Energy Solutions), Race (TN), Waste Control Specialists, etc. are accessible for the disposal of wastes generated during this contract. In addition, can the Contractor assume that, if necessary, Mound OU1 Project wastes can be shipped to the DOE Nevada Test Site for disposal. If existing DOE contracts can be utilized, please provide the information necessary to enable pricing for the disposal of Mound OU1 wastes under the existing DOE contracts?

A: The Contractor is responsible for its waste management program, including waste disposal. The DOE waste disposal contract with Envirocare is available for use by the Contractor. The DOE Envirocare contract was posted on the OU-1 RTP website (August 21, 2006). The Nevada Test Site is available so long as the waste meets the NTS Waste Acceptance Criteria and the Contractor is responsible for making arrangements for disposal at NTS through its waste management program. The current NTS disposal price is approximately \$13.00 per cubic feet for LLW and the rates fluctuate based on several factors. The NTS WAC was posted on the OU-1 RTP website. It is the Contractor's responsibility to coordinate its waste management program with the NTS and/or Envirocare. The Department cannot guarantee that NTS or Envirocare can meet the timeframes or schedule established by the contractor. The contractor should establish a realistic schedule.

The Department is not aware of any contracts with RACE (TN) or Waste Control Specialists that Contractors may want to use.

79. Section J, Attachment B, p.11, provide "Whitepaper" reference listed in "sanitary landfill" / "disposal trench."

A: The "whitepaper" referenced in Section J, Attachment B (authored by MMCIC) was posted on the OU-1 RTP website (August 21, 2006).

80. Will the CH2M HILL Mound, Inc. radiation protection and environmental health and safety procedures be available to the contractor in order to implement their use under a blue sheeting process?

A: See response to question #72.

81. The new Attachment L-3 is missing sheets for 2.4, 2.5, and 3.0. They existed in the first version and we can just add them. Please clarify your intent for a full set with precise WBS numbers.

A: **See revised response in the last sentence (also see the response to Question #91).** Due to two different funding sources associated with the planned work scope (OU-1 and PRS 441), DOE separated the original work stated in 2.4, 2.5 and 3.0 into 2.4.1 (Final Verification Survey OU-1), 2.4.2 (Final Verification Survey PRS-441), 2.5.1 (Final Grading, Seeding and Extraneous Debris Removal OU-1), 2.5.2 (Final Grading, Seeding and Extraneous Debris Removal PRS-441), 3.1 (Project Completion and Demobilization OU-1) and 3.2 (Project Completion and Demobilization PRS-441) to account for the different funding sources. Therefore, ~~sheets are no longer required for WBS 2.4, 2.5 and 3.0;~~ however, sheets are still required for 2.4, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 3.0, 3.1 and 3.2.

82. Response to Question #40 (...remove 60,960 cy berm represents 100% of berm volume...) seems to conflict with Assumption #6 (50% of berm stays in place...is not removed). Please clarify.

A: There are 60,960 cubic yards of berm material currently in place. Assumption #6 which refers to 50% of this berm material being left in place is based on the assumption that 50% of the berm material is excavated and staged.

83. Suggest modifying Table L-4 volume units from "cubic feet" to "cubic yards" for consistency and convention.

A: The Contractor shall provide waste quantities by waste type in volume (cubic feet) and weight (tons) by WBS as requested in Section L.4(f). The Contractor can also provide the volume in "cubic yards" in addition to providing the waste quantities in cubic feet and tons.

84. In section M.4, what is the difference between (a)(3) and (a)(8)? What should be included in item (8) versus what we are including in item (3)?

A: Section M.4 will be amended to delete M.4(a)(8) and changed to state "Reserved".

85. Should the items listed in Section L.3.1(a)(9) count towards 25 page limitation?

A: **Revision to Question #37 posted on 8/17/86 and 8/23/06.** After consideration of the stage of the acquisition and the language contained in Section L.3.1(a)(9), the information is not included within the 25 page limitation or within the five fold out page limitation specified in the RTP.

86. How many wells will need to be relocated/removed to allow for remediation?

A: There are three OU-1 Pump and Treat extraction wells. It is assumed that these wells will be impacted by the excavation and need to be relocated. Of the eight (8) source area wells in the OU-1 waste disposal area, it is assumed that two may need to be relocated.

87. The SOW para 2.2.3 (a) (i) is not clear. Should the first sentence read “ Extends from the west side of B2 across the south side of the Historic Waste area and north into the east side of the Sanitary Waste Landfill.”?

A: The SOW paragraph 2.2.4 (a) (i) is correct as written. See Figure 4 in the SOW.

88. What is the basis/source of the Cleanup Objectives for VOCs, SVOCs and Metals listed in Table 5 of Attachment A of the PRS-11 OSC Report??

A: The CO column for non-RADs in Table 5 of the PRS 11 OSC Report is based on the most conservative value among a Hazard Index (HI) of 1 and the Mound 2000 risk-based Cleanup Objectives. For non-RADs that do not have risk-based CO's, the HI of 1 is used. If the non-Rads do have a risk based CO value, the most conservative of the two (HI of 1 or risk-based value) is used.

89. Please provide a copy of the waste profiles as used for Mound waste shipment to dispose of the elemental mercury from the PRS-11 excavation.

A: The waste profile information is now posted on the Mound OU-1 website under the TSDF data – Summer 2005 PRS-11 Excavation category.

90. We [contractor] believe that there is only one realistic commercial disposal facility for low-level waste streams in the Statement of Work. We also understand that this commercial disposal facility is part of a bidding team. Is this commercial disposal facility required to offer all IDIQ contractors the same prices it offers to the IDIQ contractor with which it may be teaming?

A: Initially, until receipt of proposals, the Department would not conclusively have knowledge of the composition of the teams that are or may be forming in order to submit a proposal in response to this RTP. The Department cannot respond to conjecture regarding teaming arrangements or pricing that has yet to be submitted. Further, even if the Department had conclusive knowledge or the composition of teams, the Department does not disclose such at this stage in the acquisition process.

Additionally, there is no requirement in the RTP for **any** company to provide the same services at the same prices for all of the EM IDIQ contractors when the company teams with one EM IDIQ contractor and also at the same time, is proposing to provides services, via subcontract or other arrangements, with the other EM IDIQ contractors. However, the Department does not endorse any type of unfair pricing practices or pricing practices that are the cause of unreasonable costs or prices being submitted to the Department for evaluation. All companies,

regardless of whether an EM IDIQ contractor or other government contractor, are responsible for ensuring that they comply with all federal and state statutes, regulations, and laws.

The Department has posted to the OU1 Website the Department's contracts with and/or information pertaining to disposal facilities.

- 91. There is a presentation inconsistency with the L-3 forms which is allocate sum of costs from WBS 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0 equally to the following thirteen (13) lowest WBS cost elements. Only three of the higher-level L-3 roll-up sheets for WBS 2.0, 2.1, and 2.2 are included with a row entry to allocate from WBS 4.0 through 6.0. We suggest adding L-3 roll-up sheets for 2.4, 2.5, and 3.0 with similar row for "allocation from WBS 4.0 to 6.0" or perhaps it's better to remove the all rollups in their entiretysince all costs are already captured in the 13 lowest elements. In addition Section L, pg.10, Amended words below don't match the note on bottom of L-3 sheets for WBS 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0.**

Here you included a total of 10 cost elements (not 13) by blending some lowest-level WBS inputs with rollup-level WBS inputs (2.4, 2.5, 3.0).

Finally, Amendment 1, Section L.4.(c).12 still requires that "escalation" be included on Att. L-3...but the entry sheets do not have a row for escalation. Should we add a row to each sheet and the summary sheet?

A: DOE will update the Summary of Cost Worksheets to include worksheets that roll-up costs for WBS 2.4, 2.5 and 3.0. Additionally, the language at Section L.4(j) defining the "denominator" will be changed to be identical to the "Total Cost Input Base" defined on the Summary of Cost Worksheets. The correct description is: "WBS 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.3, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 3.1 and 3.2". Escalation was not included as a separate line item within the Summary of Cost Worksheets. Contractors shall apply escalation, if applicable, to the cost elements for which it is applicable and account for it within that cost element. For example, if a Contractor is proposing material costs that are to be escalated, the Contractor should apply the escalation to the cost and account for the total dollar amount within the material cost line item. Escalation percentage shall be identified within the Basis of Estimate for each cost element.

- 92. Instructions to Proposers--Section L.3.1.(a).(6) and L.3.1.(a).(13)—requires proposers to provide essentially the same response in two different portions of the Technical and Management Proposal. Please verify whether there is a need for proposers to describe their "Approach for Final Verification Survey" in two different locations in the proposal. Question #84 in previous Questions/Responses posted on the EMBC website addressed this same issue with regard to M.4.(a).(3) and M.4.(a).(8) appearing to be duplicating evaluation criteria dealing with "the contractors approach to conducting Final Verification Surveys". Amendment 1 eliminated criteria M.4.(a).(8) as being duplicative.**

A: It is the Contractor's discretion on how to cover the information requested by Section L.3.1(a)(6) and L.3.1(a)(13) in the Technical and Management Proposal.

93. There is a WBS sheet for 2.0 Environmental Remediation which we are now assuming is a roll up sheet for the 2.0 Section. Although the statement of work Section C calls for mobilization and project documentation in Section 2.0, is it a correct assumption to put project mobilization and documentation in WBS element 4.0 Project Support ?

A: Initial project mobilization should be included in Section 2.1.1 or Section 2.1.2 to remain consistent with the CLIN structure identified in Section B. In addition, project documentation costs should be captured to remain consistent with the CLIN structure. Yes, the WBS 2.0 sheet is a roll-up sheet for Sections 2.1 through 2.5.